

Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority

Work Session and Business Meeting 9:00 to 3:30

Lewis County Courthouse
351 NW North St – Chehalis 98532

October 18, 2012 - Meeting Notes

Board Members Present: Vickie Raines, City of Cosmopolis; Arnold Haberstroh, City of Chehalis; Lionel Pinn, City of Napavine; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville

Board Members Excused: Ken Estes, City of Montesano

Board Members Absent: Frank Gordon, City of Aberdeen

Consultants Present: Larry Karpach, Watershed Science and Engineering; Ray Walton, WEST Consultants

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from September 20, 2012
- Additions/changes to meeting notes
- Response to Comments on Alternatives Report
- Hydraulic Modeling PowerPoint
- Governor's Group Draft Framework for Recommendations
- Potential Capital Projects for 2013-2015 Biennium
- Potential Capital Projects Tally Sheet
- Concept Paper – Flood Authority Permitting Team

WORKSESSION

1. Call to Order and Welcome

Chairman Raines called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. She stated that this would be Bob Johnson's last Flood Authority meeting before his retirement in December.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Draft Responses to Comments on Alternatives Report and Presentation on Hydraulic Modeling

Mr. Kramer gave a quick overview of the morning agenda and summarized the comments that were sent out on the Alternatives Report. The comment period closed on August 31; 36 comments were received; 28 of those were personal stories. A number of comments advocated for water retention in the upper basin. Some comments were against water retention and suggested living with the flooding and moving things out of the way. The final report needs to continue the diversity of perspectives and acknowledge basin-wide flood mitigation.

Other issues that were raised were the substance of the hydraulic model, fish impacts, and Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) bypass and I-5 protection alternatives. A summary of staff's opinion of projects that warrant further evaluation is included at the end of the summary. Mr. Kramer asked if these should be included in the final report. A comment was made that the benefit cost analysis was not in this piece. Those comments will go to the University of Washington cost benefits center and their feedback will be part of the final comments.

Mr. Kramer stated Mr. Karpack would give an overview of the hydraulic model and issues that were raised. Mr. Karpack did an exceptional job with various conclusions which is an appendix to the Alternatives Report.

Mr. Karpack stated his objective was to give a sense of what the Watershed Science and Engineering (WSE) team did with the Flood Authority's money. Their contract was for \$400,000 and the model is to look at flood relief in the Basin.

Mr. Karpack presented a PowerPoint that showed the project milestone; a map of the model development, which covers 108 miles on the main stem plus key tributaries; the evaluation of flood relief projects; results of the modeling for four flood events; potential flood relief projects; preliminary alternatives; OFM alternatives; and evaluation of alternatives. He included screen shots of tables and a figures from WSE's draft report showing the model results.

There was confusion about the project listed as Scheuber Rd Bypass. Commissioner Averill explained that the project on Highway 6 should not be called Scheuber bypass because there is no Scheuber River or Scheuber reach. Indeed, it is the Chehalis reach which overtops SR 6 east of Scheuber Rd. There was a second project that would have been a Mellen Street chokepoint bypass. Mr. Kramer stated he would add language to make that clear.

Mr. Karpack explained that WSE's report shows results for four flood events, 1996, 2007, 2009 and a 100-year event. There are 15 individual projects and ten alternatives documenting what the water levels would be at 26 points in the Basin. Every time a project was defined, the model was used to simulate its effects with all four floods throughout the Basin.

Commissioner Willis asked if Mr. Karpack could take a different set of alternatives and calculate the impacts. She does not want people stuck on a particular group that was put into the model. Mr. Karpack stated that can be done and it is explained in the report.

Mr. Haberstroh asked if Mr. Karpack looked at best case scenarios or defined the best project alternative. Mr. Karpack stated that the modeling was designed to evaluate the potential benefits of a broad range of projects in terms of flood reductions. Mr. Kramer stated a concern in the comments was that the Ruckelshaus Center report did not give a sense of what the dam did for a range of storm events. Looking at all this information, one has to pick and choose a scenario – more can be added into the final report. In terms of alternatives, they give a sense of what the different alternatives will do; not the best project. That is a determination for the leaders of the community.

Mr. Karpack stated the work plan's primary focus was to build this hydraulic model to be able to look at the effects of various projects on water surface elevations throughout the basin. The work plan included evaluation of the dam, the Twin Cities Project, and one other alternative. Because there was

available funding under the original contract and there was interest on the part of the Flood Authority WSE kept adding alternatives to give some idea of upstream and downstream benefits.

Mr. Karpack stated that for each project the team looked at the proposed project and what would change on the ground and then incorporated the changes into the model and ran all four storms. The 1996, 2007 and 2009 events were available for this analysis because they were used for calibration of the model and then they added the theoretical 100-year event.

Mr. Johnson asked if the level of effort for modeling of other proposed projects could be translated into dollars. Mr. Karpack stated that would be difficult because he would need to know the details of the project. Opening a structure would be a one-day effort; creating a bypass would require adding a piece to the model and would be more complicated. The cost could range from a few thousand to tens of thousands of dollars. He reminded the group that this modeling is for broad scale questions. The cross sections are one to two thousand feet apart. We are not talking about a farm regrading its field and what the impact of that would be.

Mr. Karpack stated that the three top flood events in the historical record at Grand Mound were between 68,000 and 80,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). The fourth highest event, which occurred pre 1990 was 50,000 cfs. The biggest observed floods have all occurred since 1990. Bigger flows cause bigger flooding and there may be nothing that can be done to get back to pre-1990 conditions during these larger flood events.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated we are having bigger floods and they originate in different places which impact areas differently. In 2007 the Willapa hills were hit; in 2009 the hills did not see that much damage. She asked how those different storms could be accounted for in the 100 year event. Mr. Karpack stated by the statistical comparison at Grand Mound versus what was happening at each gage and what the contributions would be from all parts of the Basin. He couldn't put the 100 year event in every stream because it would then become a much larger storm (perhaps a 500 year storm or larger) on the main stem. WEST tried to get contributions that are the most statistically likely to create a 100 year flood. He emphasized that he is not saying the hydrology in the basin has changed; simply that the data shows the largest storm events have occurred since 1990. He is not saying this is a trend. The data shows that in 70 to 80 years the three biggest storms have been in the most recent 20 year period.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if no matter what we do it will not be enough. Mr. Karpack stated that to address massive flooding you need significant projects. Mr. Kramer stated if you want to reduce massive flooding you need storage.

Mr. Kramer stated a question that came up is why we don't dredge the rivers. Mr. Nelson stated the flood plain needs more capacity. Rivers move sediment – rocks, sand, etc. and that is why our flood plain capacity changes. The dynamics over time is that materials increase over time and floodplains fill in, too.

Mr. Picket stated most storage in the flood plain is below Grand Mound. You could say that storage in Thurston County is 10% of the system and that is why you see less increase downstream – it is absorbed by storage in the floodplain.

Mr. Karpack showed a slide that gave statistics on the amount of flood storage in the basin. He said that the purpose of this slide was to show that there is already a lot of storage in the floodplain and that for

any projects to have a significant effect on flooding they would need to add a significant volume of new flood storage. However even small projects in the upper basin may have some localized benefits because the upper watershed does not have as much floodplain storage. At the lower end of the system there is more floodplain storage.

Mr. Kramer asked for questions relevant to the report. Mr. Picket asked regarding the tidal effect, with this tool can you run different tides for a particular event. Mr. Walton stated he would be doing a couple of different scenarios which will be done by the end of the year.

Commissioner Willis stated there needs to be a lot of explanation to go with this and asked how it will be presented to OFM.

Mr. Kramer stated writing more words may not create the understanding. He also stated that OFM is not the major audience – it is the legislature. How do we brief the legislature knowing the limitations to this kind of detail? We have money left in Mr. Karpack's contract so we might look at how to capture more of this information – a tape or a video. He would like more discussion about what to do with the remaining funding.

Mr. Kramer asked the hydrologists and other experts in attendance about their opinion on the report. It was generally felt that the communication between experts had been very good; the scientific data has value and the modeling is good. While the model is not the final word and there might be some disagreement on certain points, this was a good exercise.

Mr. Kramer stated the experts will talk about what is next. He was very impressed with their effort and a technical group working together, mostly in consensus, is rarely seen. He commended them for their work.

Other comments related to fish impacts from water retention. Some felt that the benefits to the fish were overstated and the conclusions of the Anchor QEA report were inaccurate and did not take into account water quality, etc. Mr. Kramer stated the response to that is to acknowledge that the report does include an uncertainty and a need for biological studies to fine-tune our understanding of water retention.

Regarding the Army Corps of Engineers Twin Cities project, comments stated there is a need for better discussion of alternatives from the close out report. Our response is: the report should better reflect concerns about the project being terminated; there is not ready access to federal funding and there may be cost effective projects by the Corps that could be considered or amended.

Most of the comments were about the WSDOT report. A public meeting was held by WSDOT during the comment period when a number of concerns were brought up about a bypass and express lanes and the effect on property values, air pollution and more. There were a number of business owners who were concerned about the impact of businesses adjacent to the bypass. WSDOT stated at this stage of the process it is a concept not a design. The environmental work has not been done and these alternatives will proceed in next steps. This report was required by the legislature as to what to pursue.

Another comment was that WSDOT's report was focused on the protection of I-5 and the response was that was what the legislature required WSDOT to do. Mr. Kramer stated they did a good job and it fits

into the larger context of the alternatives report as directed by the legislature. The final report should make it clear that the I-5 alternatives are only part of a larger context.

Another concern was that the WSDOT report over-emphasized the bypass and under-emphasized a potential dam. If a dam was constructed it would lower flooding in the lower basin and that needs to be made clear.

There was a technical question regarding the freeboard standard. A 3' freeboard standard was used and that would protect I-5 in a 100 year event. This was based on the Corps project. Casey Kramer stated this is tied back to Mr. Karpack's presentation. If the 100 year flood was more than 50,000 acre feet the freeway would have been overtopped. Was this from an increase in flow from infrastructure or due to hydrology? It was probably a combination of both.

There were concerns about the tables showing impacts to homes and businesses. Those tables were for comparison purposes; more work will be needed if those numbers are affected in a negative way.

Mr. Kramer stated grammar and other errors of that type will be corrected. The report will be finalized at the end of November and Mr. Kramer hopes to have the Governor's recommendation that will fit into the report also.

Not part of the report are projects that don't seem to merit further study at this point. Mr. Kramer stated there were at least three that don't seem worthy of further analysis because from the modeling they don't do much or they have affects that seem unacceptable at this point. Those projects consist of large scale dredging, bank erosion and sediment management; the Corps levee projects; and WSDOT's idea of moving or elevating I-5. In the case of the last item, the cost would be prohibitive and elevating I-5 will send more water into the Basin causing more flooding.

Mr. Kramer asked for feedback on whether these projects merit further consideration.

Commissioner Averill agreed that those three should not be considered, except that bank erosion and sediment management projects could remain in consideration. He suggested a fourth - large bypass projects (like Mellen Street) which would move water really quickly.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if Mr. Kramer was also including flood routes that could get people through a flooded area. Mr. Kramer stated no, those were not included.

Mr. MacReynold asked if it included an elevated alternate that runs along the railroad track. Mr. Kramer stated that was not included, either. Mr. MacReynold stated the City of Chehalis would like to see that tabled because it cuts through neighborhoods and it would split the city. Mr. Kramer stated that point can be made. Mr. Johnson stated WSDOT was instructed to include a wide range of alternatives; they did not suggest it was a feasible project.

Mr. Kramer stated he would recommend this from the price and impact standpoint. We can say that members of the Flood Authority did not think they should be considered but that the report is going forward. Some of the legislators will want to talk about that alternative.

Ms. Deanna Zieske thanked Mr. Kramer for the comment period extension. The proposed express lane and elevated road would go through part of the Chehalis West Convalescent Center among other places

and this was the least expensive alternative rather than extending I-5 to 6 lanes. She hoped it would be taken off the list.

Mr. Kramer stated there is support for taking the Mellen Street water bypass and the traffic bypass off of the list.

Mr. Vanell stated when these are taken off of the list there will be someone to explain to the legislators why that happened. Mr. Kramer stated that is the idea; the position can be taken by the Flood Authority that they are narrowing the issues to consider. We could say that it was looked at and this is why it should not be pursued. We need to be clear about what should be done.

Mr. Haberstroh stated it looks like the traffic bypass is being considered. He asked how many people want that to go forward. Mr. Kramer stated that can be brought up when the right people from WSDOT are present.

4. Update on Governor's Group and Group's Recommendation Framework

The paper that was distributed reviewed the most recent devastating floods and actions that have been taken to reduce flood damage and prepare citizens to take measures that will protect their property. A group has been tasked by the Governor to develop recommendations for next steps for flood damage reduction projects in the Chehalis Basin.

The strategy of the group is to focus on how to reduce flood damage and the five elements that the group sees that need to be included in a basin-wide solution.

The work plan for the next two years is to determine the feasibility and select major capital projects that will significantly reduce flood damage across a large geographic area, including upstream water retention, I-5 improvements and lower Basin conveyance/protection.

There is a need to continue to educate people about projects and potential benefits and impacts and evaluate the extent of flood damage through smaller projects.

There was a discussion about water reduction, damage reduction and how flood levels correlate to damage. Mr. Kramer understood from the Board that the paper generally made sense and is going in the right direction. Commissioner Willis and others wanted to look it over a little more carefully and Mr. Kramer reminded them that the next Governor's Group meeting was Monday, October 22 and asked to have comments by Friday, October 19. The last meeting of this group will be on November 5 and then they meet with the Governor on November 14. By that time the Governor will have reviewed the recommendations and come to her conclusion which will go into her budget before December.

The meeting recessed at 12:04 for a lunch break, resuming at 1:15 p.m.

Chairman Raines called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m. Self-introductions were made by all attending.

5. Update on Jobs Now Projects

Mr. Boettcher stated the airport levee, Adna berm and Bucoda project had interlocal agreements with OFM and were under way. The Airport project is going through the process of assessing the cultural resources impacts as well as wetlands. The Adna berm will be in two phases. The first phase will be drainage cleaning, brush clearing and other non-environmental impact work. The second phase will be

culvert assessments and repair work. Because of the water feature it will require more permitting. Bucoda's engineer will be contracted to do the design work for that project.

Projects that have already been contracted: The tribal gage has been installed and is operational with USGS; all of the design projects have been signed by the Tribe and Mr. Boettcher will work with OFM next week to get those contracts into place; two critter pads have been installed. Mr. Boettcher stated there are photos of the progress on the critter pads on the iPRMT website.

Commissioner Willis stated that the Satsop project has gone out for an RFQ (Request for Qualifications) which Grays Harbor County funded prior to getting a contract with OFM. The Wishkah Road project will be approved by the Grays Harbor Commissioners at Monday's meeting.

Mr. Kramer stated he met with legislative staff for the House Capital Budget and Senate Ways and Means to give them an update on the Alternatives Report. In that briefing, he included the Flood Authority's work on the Jobs Now Act projects and the collaborative effort between the Tribe and the Flood Authority and it was Mr. Kramer's opinion that that had been extremely successful. Susan Howson mentioned this to Mr. Dunshee and the requirement that the joint approval had been very successful. Mr. Dunshee was very pleased with that. There will be a House Capital Budget committee meeting on November 29 and Chairman Dunshee would like a presentation on the status in the Chehalis Basin. The good work that the Flood Authority has done was transmitted back to the legislators and was received with great appreciation.

6. Potential Capital Projects for Next State Biennium Budget

Mr. Kramer reported that Mr. Boettcher and the Project Committee and others have done a lot of work in identifying potential projects for the next biennium. Mr. Boettcher developed a matrix with a description of each of the projects that have been submitted, as well as a tally sheet that shows the project and total cost and recommendation. This will be provided to the Governor's Group next Monday to see if they have any feedback, and then brought back to the Flood Authority on November 1.

Mr. Boettcher stated these materials had been sent out earlier in the week; changes were still being received as of last night so Mr. Boettcher updated the documents and those have the October 18 footer. There are two documents – one with the details and one with the financials.

Mr. Boettcher stated the Project Committee was asked to review the previous matrix and check in with the jurisdictions. The full Flood Authority responded. Mr. Boettcher has spoken with most jurisdictions' public works directors and others who have projects for clarifying details. He thanked everyone for their cooperation.

Each project has a description and the benefits it will provide. The three bullets are the total project estimate, with the second bullet being what the jurisdiction could reasonably spend in the 2013-2015 biennium.

Mr. Boettcher reviewed each project. The projects and associated costs are:

- Chehalis River Bank Erosion at Satsop Business Park \$ 52,000
- Elma-Porter Flood Mitigation Project \$ 6,200,000
- Satsop River Floodplain Restoration \$ 1,009,800
- Wishkah Road Flood Levee \$ 2,912,000

• Market Street Dike	\$ 670,000
• Trail/Dike behind Burger King	\$ 140,000
• Wishkah River East Bank Dike	\$ 270,000
• Mill Creek Dam Improvements	\$ 2,000,000
• Mary's River Lumber Bank Protection	\$ 2,000,000
• Scheuber Rd (SR6) Culvert	To be determined (Commissioner Averill stated this problem was created by WSDOT and this project may be looked at as a transportation project rather than the Jobs budget but he wants to keep it on the list because it is something that needs to be done).
• City of Centralia China Creek Flood Project	\$16,800,000
• Airport Levee (Phase II)	\$ 2,600,000
• Dillenbaugh Creek Realignment	\$ 500,000
• Kirkland Road Culvert Project	\$ 255,000
• Pe Ell WWTP Flood Prevention Dike	\$ 521,000
• Bucoda Levee Improvement (Phase II)	\$ 305,000
• Regrade Main St. (Bucoda)	\$ 174,263
• Chehalis River Basin Fish Habitat Projects	\$ 2,000,000

Mr. Boettcher stated that the Flood Authority needs to think about how to prioritize these projects. On the Excel spreadsheet the projects are listed in the same order (as above) and the column with the 2013-15 cost totals more than \$26 million. It's not likely that if \$26 million is asked for that it will be put into the Capital Budget.

Commissioner Averill stated the Flood Authority received \$5 million this year and the chance that it would grow is unlikely. He suggested letting the legislators know the magnitude of what we are looking at. What the Community College system does is put all of their construction projects for the biennium on a list and prioritize them so when the Capital Budget committee looks at it, they already have the suggestion of the most important projects. If there is a limit to the construction budget, the projects above that amount get funded and the ones below are put on a waiting list. Commissioner Averill thought the entire list should go to them but it should be prioritized.

Mr. Boettcher stated the last column on the Excel spreadsheet showed the project type. He thought that might be helpful when it came to prioritizing the projects.

Mr. Kramer stated the last project is the Conservation Commission project. The Governor's Group recommended a separate category for habitat improvements. He understood that this list was looking for projects for flood damage reduction, so the Conservation Commission project might be considered to be moved to another pot. Mr. Boettcher and Mr. Kramer thought the Conservation Commission had identified other critter pads that should be built but they have not been submitted.

Commissioner Averill stated there is still money to be spent from the Conservation Commission. Thurston County could ask for some of that for critter pads. There are two sources of funding for that type of thing: SRF Board funding and NRCS funding, which requires a match. Commissioner Averill thought Bob Amrine might be looking at the \$2 million as a local match for some of those projects.

Commissioner Willis asked if there was a way to match up the project type with the five elements mentioned in the earlier document for flood damage reduction. If we are going to prioritize the list our

projects should mirror that. Mr. Boettcher stated that is why the conversation needs to be had – we are still sifting through the information. Commissioner Willis wants to make sure that the legislators are not given two lists that don't match.

Mr. Kramer stated the question now is how to prioritize. A previous discussion about criteria included five items: 1) contributions to public safety (prevent flood damage; reduce flood hazards; spatial distribution of benefits throughout the Basin); 2) economics and environmental; 3) adverse impacts; 4) cost and funding, O & M; and 5) community support. Some of this information is in Mr. Boettcher's summary; some would have to be added. Is the Project Committee the right group to take the first cut at the prioritization and come back to the Flood Authority?

Mr. Boettcher stated it would be helpful to know what everyone's sense is about prioritization.

Commissioner Willis noted that some projects are for design. She asked how favorably the Capital Budget would consider those. It would help this process as to whether we put design projects on the list.

Commissioner Averill again used the Community College process as an example. There is a three-step process: preliminary design, final design, and construction. The project had to go through each hurdle to get completed, but once it went through design, it was assured of getting on the construction list. The Capital Budget committee is used to working with the Community College process and he recommended coming up with preliminary design, final design and construction.

Chairman Raines thought OFM would look more closely at those that had final design: the Aberdeen Dike projects as well as Wishkah Rd project and Satsop project. Mr. Boettcher stated those are also projects that the Flood Authority has already started at some level. Chairman Raines also thought the airport levee Phase II could be prioritized. She welcomed other ideas.

Mr. Kramer stated that of the Jobs Now Act total funding, the \$5 million for the Chehalis Basin was a small piece. If the money across the board is not expended by the time the legislature comes in there will be serious questions about mobilizing to make things happen. He believed the better the track record in the Chehalis Basin for getting things moving, design or construction, the more favorable it will look in that process.

After discussion, Mr. Kramer recapped by saying that projects that have been invested in now should be at the top of the list for the projects that are funded in the next biennium. There were thumbs up for that proposal.

Mr. Kramer asked if there are other ways to prioritize. Commissioner Averill said there are a couple of projects that are quite small and if there was a major project they might not be needed. However, if the major project is far off, projects like the Pe Ell waste water treatment plant project would provide vital protection and that could be raised up on the list.

Chairman Raines suggested asking for \$26 million. She stated the legislature gave the Flood Authority \$5 million to see what it could do with it and she said a lot has been accomplished. Ask for all of it and give the legislature the entire list.

Mr. Vanell asked if completion dates would have any bearing on the prioritization. If a project can be finished before the end of this biennium that could be an incentive to fund it.

Mr. Kramer stated completion of a project by next July is basically asking for an extension of these funds, not talking about what is needed for the next biennium. If a project that we have funds for cannot be completed by the end of the biennium, at least getting it started is very critical.

Mr. Vanell asked if there would be special consideration given to safety of citizens. Safety is foremost for the Town of Bucoda. When there is a major flood a quarter of Bucoda's population cannot be reached by emergency vehicles. Mr. Kramer asked if Mr. Vanell was advocating for criteria that relates to the severity and the number of people in the community affected. Mr. Vanell stated yes, he would like that to be a consideration.

Mr. Kramer asked for other opinions on that matter. Mr. Haberstroh stated that he didn't think the project should be limited to the number of people that it affects because the effect on Bucoda will be a lot less compared to the bigger cities.

Mr. Thompson stated the projects were whittled down from the list of over 200 projects. The projects that are already started and for which there is funding would be the obvious direction to go.

Chairman Raines stated the discussion was will there be money to get the rest of the projects done and we decided we needed to get the engineering and cost analysis done before moving to the next phase. She thought it was the natural step to take those projects already started and fund them. She didn't think the Authority would want to spend all the money on engineering with nothing else getting done.

Mr. Kramer stated, based on Mr. Boettcher's calculations, if we move as a top priority those projects that are currently being funded this biennium to fund the next step in the next biennium, they total about \$7.5 million.

Chairman Raines asked to have those clarified. Mr. Boettcher stated they are the Satsop River Floodplain Restoration; Wishkah Road; Market Street Dike; Trail/Dike behind Burger King; Mary's River Lumber Bank Protection; Airport Levee Phase II; and the Bucoda Levee Improvement Project, all of which total approximately \$9 million.

Chairman Raines stated the Authority would need \$10 million for the projects and staff support, and that doesn't count any projects that the Chehalis Tribe might want to have done. If the legislature wants to fund over \$10 million, there is another list of projects that will require up to \$26 million.

Ms. Fund asked if they only want to give us \$6 million do they fund the projects they want. She does not know how the legislature works in the current environment.

Commissioner Averill stated he has worked with the legislature for 20 years and we can't ask for a \$10 million dollar project and expect they will just give it to us. There will be many arguments. When the project committee put this together, it was not in the order the projects should be done but the order in which they came up. Now that we have \$10 million worth of projects, we must give some thought as to which ones are more important.

Chairman Raines understands that point of view; however, the legislators gave us the money to get started on the projects. Studies and analyses have been going on since the 1930s and she would not like engineering and costs that have gone towards the current studies to go on to something else. If we have to go back in a few years the analysis will need to be updated. She thought the Flood Authority should go forward by saying it did what the legislature asked, that these projects will be done by July 2013 and in order to complete what they had us start we need \$10 million for these other projects. She did not think that the projects within the \$9 million should not be prioritized.

Commissioner Willis thought the legislators would choose the projects that best fit the dollars to spend if they cannot fund all of the projects.

Mr. Haberstroh thought the Flood Authority should ask for \$26 million and let the legislators whittle it down.

Mr. Kramer stated there is agreement that the full list of \$26 million should be presented. If there needs to be a prioritization, the Flood Authority has identified that those projects that were started in this biennium should be finished in the next. Mr. Kramer stated he can check this with the state people about strategy and provide feedback at the next meeting.

Commissioner Averill stated that unfortunately this list was put together quickly and some costs have not been nailed down. This list isn't one that will be finished by the end of the 2015 biennium. The Satsop River project has only asked for part of the money for that project. The legislature will move the \$450,000 from this biennium to the next but it will be part of the total. Other projects will be reduced because that amount was included. None of the Aberdeen projects will be finished in the biennium and it all appears to be design money. More work needs to be done by the Project Committee to look at where we are – which projects can be finished by 2015 – and are we asking for final design or for final design and construction, etc.

Mr. Kramer stated since these projects did come in rather quickly that we look again at the costs and recommend the full list of the prioritization of what has been started, and that the strategy can be taken to Keith Phillips.

Mr. Boettcher stated the first priority is to keep the projects moving forward that have already started and then organize the projects – small versus large, preliminary design, final design and construction. We talked about people wanting to see things happen right away with safety as a criterion. He asked if the Board wanted him to work this into some organization or leave it the way it is.

Mr. Kramer stated there is agreement on the total list and the first cut in priority. He suggested the descriptions of the project be spelled out further so they capture the criteria that were talked about. That is as far as we have reached agreement until we hear if there is advice from others regarding strategy from the legislature. By November 1st we will have heard back from the Governor's office and then we can see if the list needs to be refined.

Mr. Kramer stated Mr. Boettcher's assignment is to make sure these descriptions capture all of the information that we should have on these projects; to know there are priorities; and, see if anyone wants to make adjustments to the cost elements of the projects.

Commissioner Averill stated the list should have at the top those that have already been started. Chairman Raines stated it should show the first \$9+ million and everything else below. The legislature will choose the projects to fund.

Mr. Boettcher stated it sounds like there are two lists: the one with projects that we have already started in no priority order, and another list of projects that we have not started but we have vetted at some level in no priority order.

Chairman Raines stated we do not want to give them two lists – all the projects should be on one list.

Ms. Powe stated in the original discussion about the Jobs bill the Flood Authority was asked what projects would be ready to go if they had \$10 million. There was a list of projects and the legislature looked at the list and gave the Flood Authority \$5 million. There were other projects on the \$10 million list that she did not see on the new list. One of them was home raising or land acquisition. Ms. Powe thought the projects that were presented originally should be included.

Ms. Raines stated there had been a discussion on the list which was initiated by Ms. Fowler in a hurry and did not have a lot of input from other Flood Authority members. Those projects should be considered.

Commissioner Willis stated home acquisition was not on the Jobs list; she thought it was one that they took out because there are other funding sources. The Wishkah Rd project does have the raising of homes included and the dollar amount has been separated out in case the legislature does not want to fund that part.

7. Permitting Team

Mr. Boettcher stated this concept is simple: with a team of dedicated folks a lot more can be accomplished. Commissioner Averill mentioned the wetland challenge on the Adna berm project and challenges with permitting. If expediency is of the order, something like a permitting team might be of value to consider. What this permitting team is modeled after is what is done by the Department of Transportation where dedicated resources are provided to work on transportation projects, and in this case they are co-located in a single office and work collectively on the same series of projects. How something like this gets funded and implemented raises some questions, but this was intended to pique your interest to see if it is something you would like to pursue.

Mr. Kramer stated one approach is to ask for some dedicated funding and another approach could be to ask the Governor's office to convene the state regulatory agencies and allow some staff to create an informal but informed team of people to help move these projects forward.

Mr. Boettcher stated for the projects we have now, the best thing to do is to lean on the agencies, but that is not as effective as a dedicated group of folks. Agencies are facing budget exercises and getting their attention is not as easy as calling them to come forward.

Mr. Boettcher stated his paper was just a concept; the Flood Authority wanted him to go further to see how to implement it.

Mr. Johnson stated the Governor's office has the Office of Regulatory Assistance (ORA) and Lewis County has used that agency on a couple of complex projects, so the foundation of what is being

discussed already exists. We do not know what the incoming administration is going to do, but there are already people in place that bring together the various state agencies. This was used when Lewis County worked on the Cardinal Glass project. It was stalling and ORA got those agencies together and made that project a priority.

8. Public Comment

This item was to be considered later in the agenda.

9. Lunch

This occurred earlier in the agenda.

10. Gage Maintenance

Mr. Kramer asked where the jurisdictions were with respect to identifying the ability to pay the allocation for gage maintenance that was recommended at the August meeting.

Mr. Boettcher stated Napavine committed to both the remainder for this year and for all of next year; Grays Harbor County has budgeted for the future; he did not know about the rest of this year. Commissioner Willis stated Grays Harbor County will more than likely have the funds for both. She would like Mr. Boettcher to give a demonstration on the Early Warning System before the Board of County Commissioners that can be taped.

Mr. Kramer stated each jurisdiction has agreed to their allocation with the exception of Aberdeen which has not made a decision.

Chairman Raines stated she thought Aberdeen's decision was to withdraw from the Flood Authority but at their last meeting they decided not to vote on that so, they would remain a member. They did not address the issue of the Early Warning System allocation.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked what the impact would be to the other Flood Authority members if someone chooses not to pay.

Chairman Raines stated she has spoken to Commissioner Willis who is on the Project Committee and Ms. Fund who is on the Education and Outreach Committee. There will be a meeting on November 29 and Chairman Raines would like Mr. Boettcher to meet with a delegation from the City of Aberdeen. There are issues if Aberdeen does not participate in the allocation of the Early Warning System; the projects in their city need to be addressed.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked what Mr. Boettcher's methodology is; what is the impact on other Flood Authority members if members choose not to pay.

Mr. Boettcher stated his methodology for which the original allocation was computed was: he took the population of the unincorporated county and the population of incorporated cities that are members and distributed the cost among those people. If an incorporated city was not a member then the methodology used was to assume they were part of the unincorporated county. No decision by the Flood Authority has been made about going forward in the event that Aberdeen doesn't pay – how the allocation will be computed.

Mr. Kramer thought Commissioner Valenzuela was asking if Aberdeen decides to pull out and not pay, based upon the methodology that was used, that amount would have been allocated to Grays Harbor County. That would be consistent with the methodology that came up with the first allocation. It was Mr. Kramer's understanding from talking with Chairman Raines and Mr. Vander Stoep, who attended the Aberdeen City Council meeting that the hope is to help them understand the benefits of staying in (i.e. funding for projects in the next biennium) and that they would see the benefit of paying the allocation for the warning system. The City of Aberdeen has not seen the benefits of the Early Warning System; they have only heard criticism from the public works director.

Mr. Thompson stated Plan A is to convince Aberdeen to stay on the Flood Authority. Plan B is to re-allocate Aberdeen's share of the gage maintenance to Grays Harbor County. Mr. Thompson wanted to suggest a Plan C and that would be to pass the hat for Aberdeen's share – re-distribute the funding between all jurisdictions.

Commissioner Willis stated since the 2007 flood Lewis County has been consumed with the flooding issue and the Grays Harbor County citizens were not in that mind set until just recently. She thought it was important for this issue that the Flood Authority does good outreach and goes out of its way to do this – let the process work. Take this to Aberdeen, show them the advantages and react to what happens after that.

Mr. Kramer thought it was agreed to reach out to the City of Aberdeen; his sense is there is no agreement on Plan B or C and based on early discussion about capital projects it might be wise not to articulate a Plan B or C at this time.

Chairman Raines stated with respect to the projects that have money allocated and the Tribe has approved, if Aberdeen does not stay a member or participate in the allocation, she would like to see those projects still move forward. They are within the basin. If those projects (F, G and possibly E on the list) are to move forward, the oversight should not be with the City of Aberdeen but with some other agency.

Commissioner Valenzuela thought everything possible should be done to keep Aberdeen at the table and understanding the importance of operating and maintaining the Early Warning System, including them paying their fair share. The notion has been introduced that they can stay a member of the Flood Authority without paying their share but we have not had that conversation as a Flood Authority. Commissioner Valenzuela did not agree that one can have all the benefits of a member and not pay any of the responsibilities and she does not want that notion out there – it has not been decided yet.

Chairman Raines stated that was her comment and she apologized. She has been a member of other organizations where someone could be at the table and give comment but could not vote or participate in benefits.

Mr. Johnson stated a contract with WEST is waiting for some kind of decision to move forward. Some maintenance will need to be done soon on some of the gages. There is also the \$3000 subscription and the idea of making access to the website without some kind of password which adds some cost. He would like some direction as to where to move on that contract. If everyone sent their money in for this year WEST could get started and could be reimbursed for the subscription that they have already made.

Commissioner Averill stated Dave Curtis has already put out the money for the software maintenance, which is to be repaid. He did that so we have the system for the winter. Most of us have agreed to make a payment and if we make those payments they will go into a fund for this contract and we can then do the work order with WEST Consultants and give them initial payments. There are enough who have already obligated that we can get this started.

Mr. Johnson stated he had the contract ready but did not have authorization to go ahead with it. He also does not have clear direction regarding the password issue. No decision was made about that. Mr. Boettcher stated \$1500 would get a no-log-in for a .com address; for another \$40 per month the Flood Authority could have any URL it wanted.

Mr. Kramer stated Mr. Johnson is asking for approval to send the bills and to move on the contract. There were thumbs up on that proposal.

Mr. Johnson stated that did not include the \$1500. Mr. Boettcher asked to move on that.

Commissioner Averill stated the contract as it currently exists requires that you enter your ID and password to get into the website. If it is possible to eliminate that step and it costs extra money; it has not been distributed out. We need to distribute the \$1500 for folks to pay it. Mr. Johnson stated Mr. Boettcher would need to come up with a cost allocation and Lewis County could put that in with the other bill.

Mr. Kramer asked if there was support for moving the additional \$1500. Commissioner Valenzuela asked if it made sense to do that this late in the year. She asked if the first bill would be for the remainder of 2012 why couldn't it be billed on the 2013 statement.

Mr. Boettcher asked if Mr. Johnson was looking at a two-part bill: bill for the present allocation from now to January and from January forward it would be the existing allocation plus the \$1500. Mr. Johnson stated the flood season is coming up and there is an early warning system that the public can't generally access. That should be done fairly soon, and he suggested adding the \$1500 to the 2012.

Mr. Kramer asked if it was possible, since the maintenance will not be done, to take the \$1500 out of the existing funding. Mr. Johnson stated he would check with Mr. Curtis.

Chairman Raines asked if the \$1500 for 2012 was pro-rated for the remainder of the year. Commissioner Averill stated no; this contract started on the first of July. Chairman Raines asked about the \$1500 to change the website – and the \$40 a month extra – if that is pro-rated.

Mr. Johnson stated he would get more clarification. He didn't think the \$1500 should be paid for two months and then paid again in January.

Mr. Kramer stated the direction is to move forward sending out the bills, move forward with the contract, and investigate if the access issue can be changed within the current dollars.

Mr. Kramer asked for other comments regarding the gage maintenance or Aberdeen.

Mr. Vanell asked if it would be beneficial to Aberdeen to show they are using a flood warning system in regard to FEMA or the Community Rating System. Mr. Swartout stated it would not make a difference

on its own. If a community is in the Community Rating System and it has an increased ability to inform its citizens about an impending flood it might get more points. It could benefit that community to going to the next class for an additional reduction on insurance rates, but being in the Early Warning System is not going to impact insurance rates.

Mr. Boettcher was told by Dr. Curtis recently that all of the gages are installed and operational.

11. Flood Authority Staffing

Mr. Kramer stated he reminded the Chair and Vice Chair that in June the Flood Authority approved talking about the staffing issue after three months to see if it was working.

Chairman Raines asked for comments. Mr. Thompson stated the Executive Board discussed this and its recommendation was to continue with the present staff. Chairman Raines confirmed that.

Commissioner Averill stated he had no issues with Mr. Kramer's contract or with SBGH's contract but he did have a problem with GTH's contract. He was not clear on what the Authority was getting for \$1000 a month besides news releases, which he already has.

Mr. Kramer stated that Ms. Fowler's recommendation during the transition was to keep Nancy Ligon working on doing some things she had been doing for Ms. Fowler. For the most part, that has been narrowed down to scheduling the Executive Committee meetings and sending out correspondence. She has also helped set up the Project Committee meetings. This was discussed with Mr. Johnson and Mr. Kramer stated he and Mr. Boettcher did need some assistance in organizing some meetings and if Mr. Johnson's staff could take that over then the support from Ms. Ligon would not be needed. Mr. Johnson stated his office had the capacity to do that and the rates are considerably less than the rates charged by GTH.

Mr. Kramer stated Ms. Ligon also made arrangements for the conference calling number. Mr. Boettcher stated he had free conference calling capabilities.

Chairman Raines stated she appreciated receiving the newspaper articles and news releases. She asked if Mr. Johnson's staff could continue to do that. Mr. Johnson thought that could be done.

Ms. Lee thought that \$1000 was a lot of money and it could be used better elsewhere.

Chairman Raines asked if there were other comments regarding Mr. Kramer's and SBGH Partners' contracts. There were none.

Mr. Kramer stated he would contact Ms. Ligon on Friday and inform her that Lewis County has agreed to take over her duties and that it has nothing to do with her performance.

BUSINESS MEETING

Chairman Raines stated the meeting had already been called to order and introductions were made earlier.

3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Kramer stated Item 7 could be deleted since it was discussed during the work session. Chairman Raines stated there would be no State Team Report. There were thumbs up on the agenda.

4. Approval of September 20 meeting notes

Ms. Lee stated Mr. Vander Stoep had some corrections to the meeting notes. Mr. Vander Stoep stated when he gave his report in Montesano there were a couple of words left out that he felt were important and he wanted those added. The changes were on page 6, fourth paragraph. Mr. Vander Stoep submitted the changes. There were no other changes and there was approval with changes.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Al Smith, Wishkah Valley, spoke to the Aberdeen issue. He believed that if you are part of the process and taking money from the process you should contribute to the process. He hoped the delegation from Aberdeen would include Mr. Bledsoe, the Aberdeen Mayor, Kathy Hoder and Jim Cook. Aberdeen needs to be part of the Flood Authority.

6. Reports

a. Chair's Report

Chairman Raines stated that Cosmopolis had started some strategic planning on Mill Creek dam. She stated she had received communication from the Quinault Indian Nation regarding scheduling a potential meeting. She will keep the Authority informed when that happens.

b. Member Reports

Chehalis – No report.

Napavine – No report.

Thurston County – Commissioner Valenzuela stated Thurston County passed a resolution proclaiming next week as Flood Awareness Week. One of the pieces of literature was prepared by the Emergency Management department and explained how to be more prepared for a flood, which included a page about the Early Warning System and how to access it. In addition, at a recent BOCC meeting, new regulations were adopted for development in the flood plain which included new NFIP rates.

Lewis County – Commissioner Averill stated Lewis County will be having a first responders meeting early in November to kick off the flood season.

Oakville – Mr. Thompson thanked the Education and Outreach Committee on behalf of the City of Oakville. He stated that over the last two years the city has been working on the storm water and maintenance and drainage program. In the past that consisted of digging the ditches a little deeper and slanting them a little more. Now the City has put together agreements with local land owners where the ditch does not have to be graded as much and acreage is being utilized for overflow. In negotiating this with the local property owners, it was the Education and Outreach Committee's information that he used to help bring about this cooperation. He stated kudos should go to the entire Flood Authority because he could not have done this without all the help.

Centralia – Ms. Fund thought the tape of the morning session with Mr. Karpack would be great to get on a webinar. She then thought perhaps the Seattle *Times* could learn about this. An article in their paper some time ago stated that development in the flood plain is what caused the flood. She would like them to be educated that the building in the flood plain was very negligible in contributing to the flooding.

Regarding Centralia, she was glad that Mellen Street was taken off the table because that would impact Centralia's neighbors downstream.

Ms. Fund had talked to Mr. Boettcher about webinars to inform people of the Flood Authority. She then learned that he was going to Grays Harbor County to explain the Early Warning System and thought he could do that in other jurisdictions as well.

Pe Ell – No report.

Grays Harbor County – Commissioner Willis reported that she has been working with Mayor Estes of Montesano on the Mary's River project because there could be some savings in working several projects together. There are three projects that should be separated because of bookkeeping, etc., but they are working together to see if there is any equity in working with the companies themselves for savings. Commissioner Willis and Ms. Napier attended the National Builders Association meeting recently and did a 45-minute presentation on the Early Warning System.

Regarding the Watershed Cooperative and the Sickman Ford Bridge, Commissioner Willis stated the Tribe is still working on that. The last report is both are still under design and modeling and looking to see what their options are.

Chairman Raines asked if the Cooperative has any projects and would Commissioner Willis ensure that the Coop also speaks with the Governor's Group about any projects that can be put on the list.

Mr. Swartout stated Mr. Connelly of the Chehalis Tribe was working on a project proposal to do LiDAR across the entire watershed. There could be three organizations supporting that same project.

Bucoda – No report.

Chairman Raines stated she had not received any correspondence other than what had gone out to the whole group. She extended her appreciation to Nancy Ligon for the support she has provided over the last year or so and also a special thanks to J. Vander Stoep and Kelly Daniels for attending the last Aberdeen Council meeting. Their comments and insight aided in Aberdeen's wanting to stay at the table at least for the time being. She thanked Ms. Fund and Commissioner Willis for their participation to have that continued discussion.

7. Approval to Recommend Potential Capital Projects

This was discussed during the morning session.

8. Confirm Next Regular Meeting

The next meeting will be a special meeting on November 1 from 9:00 a.m. to noon at the Emergency Operations Center in Thurston County. Address and directions will be provided before the meeting. The next regular meeting will be on November 15, also in Thurston County, location to be determined. December's meeting will be in Grays Harbor County.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.